

REMARKS

Claims 1-24 remain in the present application. Claims 1, 6, 15, 17 and 23 are amended herein. Applicants respectfully submit that no new matter has been added as a result of the claim amendments. Applicants respectfully request further examination and reconsideration of the rejections based on the amendments and arguments set forth below.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 1-8 and 17-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. Claims 1 and 17 are amended herein to overcome these rejections.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1-5, 7, 9-14, 16-22 and 24 are rejected in the present Office Action under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being unpatentable over United States Patent Application Publication Number 2002/0103914 by Dutta et al. (hereafter referred to as “Dutta”). Applicants have reviewed the cited reference and respectfully submit that the embodiments of the present invention as recited in Claims 1-5, 7, 9-14, 16-22 and 24 are neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by Dutta for the following reasons.

Applicants respectfully direct the Examiner to independent Claim 1, which recites a method for analyzing content on a web page comprising (emphasis added):

accessing said web page comprising content;
processing the web page through a filter wherein the filter transfers
the content of the web page to an analyzer;
analyzing the content of the web page at said analyzer;

returning a result of said analyzing to a server;
appending the result of said analyzing to the content of said web
page; and
displaying said web page and said result.

Independent Claims 9 and 17 recite limitations similar to independent Claim 1. Claims 2-5, 7, 8-14, 16, 18-22 and 24 depend from their respective independent Claims and recite further limitations to the claimed invention.

Applicants respectfully submit that Dutta fails to teach or suggest the limitations of “appending the result of said analyzing to the content of said web page” as recited in independent Claim 1. As recited and described in the present application, the content of a web page is analyzed. Results from this analysis are then appended to the content of a web page.

In contrast to the claimed embodiments, Applicants understand Dutta to teach *removing* search results that do not meet accessibility level requirements based upon a comparison of the search results to accessibility level requirements (paragraph 137). As such, Dutta fails to teach *analysis* results as claimed, but instead only teaches *search* results. Further, Dutta teaches *removing* search result entries rather than *appending* analysis results to the content of a web page as claimed. As such, Dutta teaches away from the claimed embodiments.

Applicants respectfully submit that Dutta fails to teach or suggest the limitations of “displaying said web page and said result” as recited in independent Claim 1. As recited and described in the present application, after the web page is appended with the results from the analysis of the web page, the updated web page comprising the results is then displayed.

In contrast to the claimed embodiments, Applicant fails to find any teaching in Dutta of the display of a web page and results of analysis of the web page as claimed. As such, Applicants again submit that Dutta fails to teach or suggest “displaying said web page and said result” as recited in independent Claim 1.

For these reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that independent Claim 1 is neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by Dutta, thereby overcoming the 35 U.S.C. §102(b) rejection of record. Since independent Claims 9 and 17 recite limitations similar to those discussed above with respect to independent Claim 1, independent Claims 9 and 17 also overcome the 35 U.S.C. §102(b) rejections of record. Since dependent Claims 2-5, 7, 8-14, 16, 18-22 and 24 recite further limitations to the invention claimed in their respective independent Claims, Claims 2-5, 7, 8-14, 16, 18-22 and 24 are also neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by Dutta. Therefore, Claims 1-5, 7, 9-14, 16-22 and 24 are allowable.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 6, 8, 15 and 23 are rejected in the present Office Action under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Dutta in view of United States Patent Application Publication Number 2002/0156799 by Markel et al. (hereafter referred to as “Markel”). Applicants have reviewed the cited references and respectfully submit that the embodiments of the present invention as recited in Claims 6, 8, 15 and 23 are not rendered obvious by Dutta in view of Markel for the following reasons.

Applicants respectfully submit that Markel, either alone or in combination with Dutta, fails to cure the deficiencies of Dutta discussed above. Specifically,

Markel also fails to teach or suggest the limitations of “appending the result of said analyzing to the content of said web page” and “displaying said web page and said result” as recited in independent Claim 1. Since dependent Claims 6, 8, 15 and 23 recite further limitations to the invention claimed in their respective independent Claims, dependent Claims 6, 8, 15 and 23 are not rendered obvious by Dutta in view of Markel. Therefore, Claims 6, 8, 15 and 23 are allowable.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 1-24 are in condition for allowance and Applicants earnestly solicit such action from the Examiner.

The Examiner is urged to contact Applicants' undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present Application.

Please charge any additional fees or apply any credits to our PTO deposit account number: 23-0085.

Respectfully submitted,

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO, LLP

Dated: 3/5, 2007

BMF

Bryan M. Failing
Registration No. 57,974

Two North Market Street
Third Floor
San Jose, CA 95113
(408) 938-9060